



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,832	06/27/2003	Young Mau Kim	049128-5106	4827
9629	7590	08/15/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/606,832	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stephen G. Sherman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**RICHARD HJERPE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. First, on page 2, 3rd paragraph of the applicant's response, the applicant argues that Ito et al. does not teach that the low path of the electric discharge lamp 6, shown in Figure 4, is not selectively connected to a ground voltage source, however, the examiner asserts that in Figure 4, the low path of the lamp, i.e. the side not connected to the transformer, is connected to sw4. Being that sw4 is a switch, it can selectively connect two things on either side of it. On one side of sw4, there is a lamp 6 and on the other side there is a ground voltage source shown in Figure 4. Therefore, when the switch is open lamp 6 is not connected to ground but when sw4 is closed it is connected to ground, meaning that the low path of the lamp can be selectively connected to ground. Second, on page 3, 1st paragraph of the applicant's response, the applicant argues that the motivation of enhancing "safety by reducing the difference in electric potential of the voltage supply line with respect to the ground electric potential" is simply not taught by Ito et al., however, paragraph [0010] of Ito et al. explicitly states: "...so as to enhance safety by reducing the difference in electric potential of the voltage supply line with respect to the ground electric potential." Third, on page 3, paragraph 2 of the applicant's response the applicant alleges that Payne and Ito et al. cannot be combined because the device would be rendered inoperable, however, the examiner asserts that the combination made was not meant for the circuit of Ito to be bodily incorporated into the primary reference. The examiner would like to remind the applicant that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of the reference may be bodily incorporated into the other to produce the claimed subject matter but simply what the references make obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. (In Re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545, (CCPA 1969); In re Richman 165 USPQ 509, (CCPA 1970); In re Beckum, 169 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1971); In re Sneed, 710 F2d 1544, 218 USPQ 385). Fourth, on page 4, 2nd paragraph of the applicant's response, the applicant argues that Lin et al. fails to provide proper motivation with which to modify Payne and/or Ito et al. because Payne and Ito only teach of driving one lamp and Lin et al. teach of driving multiple lamps, however, the examiner was using the reference of Payne and Ito to show the inverter and lamp relationship, and then combined the references with Lin et al. to show that this inverter/lamp structure could be applied to a configuration with multiple lamps. Lin et al. also provides, in paragraph [0004] that a CCFL is typically used as the light source for an LCD and that a large LCD panel usually requires two or more fluorescent lamps to provide sufficient backlighting. This provides ample reasons for why the CCFL lamp structure taught by the combination of Payne and Ito et al. can be incorporated into a multiple lamp set up taught by Lin et al. Finally, with regard to the continued argument for independent claim 18, the examiner would like to remind the applicant that the definition of rationale is "an explanation or exposition of the principles of some opinion, action, hypothesis, phenomenon, or the like; also, the principles themselves." Now the examiner directs the applicant's attention to the part of claim 1 that reads "a low path switching part selectively connecting low paths of the plurality of backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal," and the part of claim 18 that reads "selectively connecting a low path of each of the backlight lamps with a ground voltage source in response to an external inverter ON/OFF signal." If the references show the structure which is, as stated in the claims, able to selectively connect low paths of a plurality of backlight lamps with a ground voltage source, then the same circuit would then in function be selectively connecting a low path of each of the plurality of backlight lamps with a ground voltage source, as recited in claim 18. Therefore, the same rationale can be used to reject claim 18 that was used to reject claim 1 because there are no limitations distinguishing the method of claim 18 and the apparatus of claim 1. If the applicant would like to provide proof that the same rationale cannot be used, then the applicant should do so instead of merely alleging that the USPTO has a desire to save paper.